

### **REMARKS**

This case has been carefully reviewed and analyzed in view of the Office Action dated 28 July 2004. Responsive to the Office Action, Claim 3 is now cancelled from this case, and Claims 1 and 6 have been amended in order to place the subject matter indicated by the Examiner to be allowable in proper form for allowance. Additionally, Claims 8-11 are newly-inserted for further prosecution with the other pending Claims.

In the Office Action, the Examiner objected to Claim 6 for containing certain confusing language. The language in question is now corrected by this Amendment. A corresponding correction is incorporated into the affected appropriate paragraph of the Specification for consistency. These corrections remove a readily apparent transcription error and preserves consistency between the Specification and Drawings. As such, they are purely formal in nature and do not introduce any new matter. It is believed that such corrections now obviate the Examiner's formal concerns.

Also in the Office Action, the Examiner rejected Claims 1, 2, 4, and 5 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by the '459 Su reference. As for Claims 3, 6, and 7, the Examiner merely objected to them for being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but indicated that they would be allowable if rewritten in independent form to include all of the limitations of the base and any intervening claims.

Accordingly, the subject matter of Claim 3 is now incorporated into Claim 1, and the dependency of Claim 6 is corrected to now depend from Claim 1 rather than Claim 3. It is believed, therefore, that Claims 1-2 and 4-7 are now in allowable form.

Newly-inserted independent Claim 8 recites a combination of an inner frame and at least two blades for a plug, wherein the combination includes among its features “an inner frame including a bottom wall having at least two positioning holes formed therethrough.” As the Claim further recites, “at least two hook members each project[ ] from said bottom wall to be deflectively disposed adjacent to one of said at least two positioning holes,” such that the at least two blades passing respectively through such positioning holes are engaged and retained by the hook members formed in the inner frame.

The full combination of these and other features clearly recited by newly-inserted Claims 8-11 are nowhere disclosed by the cited Su reference. The projections 162 of the ‘459 Su reference, which the Examiner correlated to Applicant’s hook members, are formed on the clip plates 17. These clip plates 17 are themselves formed to extend from guide plates 194, 195 of an E-shaped member 19 disposed as shown. They are not formed to “each project[ ] from said bottom wall” through which the “two positioning holes [are] formed” for receiving the blades, as Claim 8 clearly recites.

It is respectfully submitted, therefore, that the cited '459 Su reference, even when considered in combination with the other references cited but not used in the Office Action, does not disclose the unique combination of elements recited by newly-inserted Claim 8, or by Claims 9-11 which depend therefrom. It is thus believed that the subject Patent Application has now been placed fully in condition for allowance, and such action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,  
For: ROSENBERG, KLEIN & LEE



Jun Y. Lee  
Registration #40,262

Dated: 25 October 2004

Suite 101  
3458 Ellicott Center Drive  
Ellicott City, MD 21043  
(410) 465-6678

Customer No.  
**04586**